

UC-NRLF



#B 64 558

P  
929  
L3  
1917  
MAIN

# Age of the Yüe-chi do-Scythians

by

BERNHOLD LAUFER, Ph.D.

Curator, Department of Anthropology,  
Field Museum of Natural History



*Lafer*

*1917*

See Announcement on first page inside



5047  
JAN 17 1912

# The Language of the Yüe-chi or Indo-Scythians

*by*

BERTHOLD LAUFER, Ph.D.

Curator, Department of Anthropology,  
Field Museum of Natural History



*Born, J. G. G. G. G.*  
*University of Chicago*

See Announcement on first page inside



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

P 929  
L 3  
1917

MAN

ANNOUNCEMENT

*WE have imported from Tokyo a font of Chinese-Japanese type, consisting of approximately twenty thousand characters, and are prepared to handle, with the competent assistance of a Japanese compositor, the printing of books and other publications requiring the use of these characters.*

*This installation was made at the suggestion of Dr. Berthold Laufer, Curator of Anthropology at the Field Museum of Natural History, and the following pages by Dr. Laufer show the type as adapted for sinological publications.*

*We solicit especially the printing of books, magazines, and catalogues of libraries, collections, and exhibitions.*

*R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company  
731 Plymouth Court  
Chicago*

*From Benj. J. Wheeler  
to University Library*





ONE OF OUR CHINESE-JAPANESE TYPE CABINETS

①

# The Language of the Yüe-chi or Indo-Scythians

*by*

BERTHOLD LAUFER, Ph.D.

Curator, Department of Anthropology,  
Field Museum of Natural History



UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA

CHICAGO  
R. R. DONNELLEY & SONS COMPANY

1917

725  
L373

Gift of Pres. office

70 1111  
ANNEX 180

FIFTY COPIES PRINTED  
FOR THE AUTHOR



# The Language of the Yüe-chi or Indo-Scythians

BY BERTHOLD LAUFER

The question of the nationality of the ancient Yüe-çi is still unsettled. It is known that KLAPROTH first classified them with Tibetans, but subsequently became converted to the theory of their Indo-European origin, identifying them with the Goths.<sup>1</sup> The Pan-Turks who have done so much mischief to the history of Central Asia did not fail to claim the Yüe-çi as their property.<sup>2</sup> This speculation is exploded not only by the very remains of the Yüe-çi language itself, but also by the formal statement of the Chinese annalists to the effect that the Yüe-çi were different from the Hiuñ-nu; they belonged to the group of Hu, that is, Iranians.<sup>3</sup> Most writers on the Yüe-çi (and there is a goodly number of them) did not commit themselves to any opinion as to the ethnical position of the tribe.<sup>4</sup> Nationality is based on language: I propose to examine the few remains of the ancient Yüe-çi language (that is, in times prior to the foundation of the Indo-Scythian empire) preserved to us in the records of the Chinese and to offer some conclusions with regard to the position of their language.

When in A.D. 87 the king of the Yüe-çi asked for a Chinese princess in marriage, he sent as gift to the Emperor Čaň of the Han dynasty precious jewels and two kinds of animals hitherto unknown to the Chinese, *š'i* ("lion") and *fu-pa*.<sup>5</sup> It is a common experience that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Tableaux historiques de l'Asie, pp. 132, 287-289. It is regrettable that F. JUSTI in his history of Iran (Grundriss, Vol. II, p. 489) still speaks of "the Tibetan Yüe-çi or Tochar," and that even to E. H. MINNS (Scythians and Greeks, p. 110) they "appear rather to have been nomad Tibetans." Polyandry is not ascribed to the Yüe-çi in any document, as asserted by Minns. The Tibetan hypothesis has been well refuted by O. FRANKE (Zur Kenntnis der Türkvölker und Skythen, pp. 25-27).

<sup>2</sup> F. HIRTH, Nachworte, p. 48; H. G. RAWLINSON, Bactria, p. 128; A. STEIN, Khotan, p. 50 ("the Yüe-çi probably spoke a language of the Turkī-Mongolian family").

<sup>3</sup> *Hou Han šu*, Ch. 117, p. 27 b.

<sup>4</sup> In regard to the older theories, which are all defective and unacceptable, see E. SPECHT, *Journal asiatique*, 1883, nov.-déc., p. 320; it is superfluous to discuss these anew in the present state of science.

<sup>5</sup> *Hou Han šu*, Ch. 127, translated by E. CHAVANNES, *T'oung Pao*, 1906, p. 232.

Chinese, whenever foreign products were brought to them for the first time, adopted together with these their foreign designations. Thus it is in the present case: *ši* and *fu-pa* are actual words received from the language of the Yüe-çi.

1. 師 and subsequently 獅, *ši*, \*š'i, lion. On a former occasion I remarked that this word originally hailed from some East-Iranian language and was transmitted to China through the medium of the Yüe-çi.<sup>1</sup> This opinion should now be modified by the formula that the word \*š'i, *ši* or *šē*, actually represents a Yüe-çi word with the meaning "lion," and that this Yüe-çi word is closely related to its Iranian congeners.

2. 符拔 *fu-pa*, \*fu-bwað, fu-bwal, fubal. As is known, this word has been identified by A. v. GUTSCHMID<sup>2</sup> with Greek *βουβαλις* or *βούβαλις*,<sup>3</sup> but he has merely added the Greek word in parenthesis to *fu-pa* by way of explanation without discussing the philological basis of the case. First of all, it must be stated that \*fubal is the Yüe-çi designation of an animal, and that this word may be related to *βουβαλις*, in the same manner as other words in Indo-European languages. Certainly \*fubal is not a Greek loan-word in Yüe-çi. Moreover, the animal of the Yüe-çi did not represent the same species as the bubalis of the ancients, as plainly follows from a close comparison of the classical and Chinese traditions. The bubalis of the ancients has been identified with *Bubalis mauretanica* of northern Africa with long tail and short, lyre-shaped antlers, as well as with other kinds of antelope.<sup>4</sup> Aeschylus<sup>5</sup> is the first author to speak of "the young bubalis serving as food to the lion" (λεοντοχόρταν βούβαλιν νεαιτέρον). Herodotus (IV, 192) places bubalis among the animals occurring in the Libyan desert, and Polybius (XII, 3, § 5) praises their beauty.<sup>6</sup> The point of interest is that in the opinion of the ancients the lion and the bubalis were arch-enemies; they were often represented jointly on engraved gems.<sup>7</sup> This notion of a contest between the two creatures may have been prevalent also in the minds of the Yüe-çi, and their gift to the Chinese Court

<sup>1</sup> *T'oung Pao*, 1916, p. 81.

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte Irans*, p. 140.

<sup>3</sup> Wrongly written by him *βούβαλος* (that is, *Bos sylvestris*, urochs).

<sup>4</sup> O. KELLER, *Antike Tierwelt*, Vol. I, p. 294.

<sup>5</sup> *Fragm.* 322 Nauck.

<sup>6</sup> See further ARISTOTLE, *Hist. an.* (ed. of Aubert and Wimmer, Vol. I, p. 64); AELIAN, *Hist. an.*, XIV, 14; PLINY, VIII, 15.

<sup>7</sup> IMHOOF-BLUMER and KELLER, *Tier- und Pflanzenbilder auf Münzen und Gemmen*, Plate XVII, 43.

savors strongly of a political allegory (the weak swallowed by the powerful). Yet the \*fubal of the Yüe-çi was an animal different from the bubalis. Certainly the Yüe-çi had not exported it from northern Africa, but it was an antelopine species indigenous in the steppes of Central Asia. According to the Han Annals, the *fu-pa* occurred in the country Wu-yi-šan-li 烏弋山離,<sup>1</sup> and together with lions (or a lion) in A.D. 87 was also sent as tribute from Parthia 安息 (\*An-sik, Ar-sik), on which occasion it is described as having the shape of a *lin* 麟, but without antlers.<sup>2</sup> In a late dictionary, the *Er ya i* of the twelfth century, the *fu-pa* is defined as "resembling a stag, and being provided with a long tail and a single horn." The word \*fubal, accordingly, was not only Yüe-çi, but also belonged to the speech of the Parthians. Again, the affinity of the Yüe-çi language points to Iran.

3. Another Yüe-çi animal-name is handed down, not in the official annals, but in the *Hüan čün ki* 立中記 written by Kuo 郭 (his personal name is unknown) in the fifth century or earlier. This is the Yüe-çi term for the "ox," transcribed in Chinese by means of the character 及 *ki*, anciently \*g'iep. The text of the *Hüan čün ki*, as far as I know, is not preserved, and we have to rely on extracts from it given by later writers. The fact that the name of the animal was 及 is guaranteed by the very careful work *T'ai p'in huan yü ki*<sup>3</sup> published by Yo Ši 樂史 in the latter part of the tenth century. The Chinese ascribe a miracle to this peculiar cattle-breed of the Yüe-çi: three or four pounds of its flesh may be sliced off, yet the wound will heal in the course of a day (in other texts, on the following day), and the animal is then restored to its normal size.<sup>4</sup> In the most detailed version of the story that I have been able to trace<sup>5</sup> it is added under the name of the *Hüan čün ki*, "Chinese who

<sup>1</sup> Regarded by CHAVANNES (*T'oung Pao*, 1904, p. 555) as a transcription of Alexandria (\*U-yir-šan-ri) and identified with Strabo's Alexandria in Aria.

<sup>2</sup> *Hou Han šu*, Ch. 118, p. 4 (see CHAVANNES, *T'oung Pao*, 1907, p. 177); repeated in *T'ai p'in huan yü ki*, Ch. 184, p. 6 b.

<sup>3</sup> Ch. 80, p. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Cf., for instance, *T'ai p'in yü lan*, Ch. 900, p. 2b, with the misprint 反 for 及. As will be seen from the *T'ai p'in huan yü ki* (*l. c.*), the spurious work *Po wu č'i* erroneously ascribes this ox to the district Yüe-sui 越嵩 in Se-č'uan. The *Pen ts'ao kañ mu* (Ch. 51 A, p. 7) cites the "ox of the Yüe-çi" as a special variety, and simply quotes the text of the *Hüan čün ki*, but without giving the native name. Some texts say that the animal occurs in the country of the Ta Yüe-çi (*T'ai p'in yü lan* writes 月支) and the western Hu 西胡 (that is, Iranians), others omit the latter term. Suñ Yiñ 宋應, in his *I wu č'i* 異物志, adopted a humane attitude toward the story, and had the tail ten pounds in weight of the Yüe-çi ox cut off and restored.

<sup>5</sup> *T'u šu tsi č'en*, sub 蠶. Here the name of the animal is given as 日及, "the ox *ki* of the day," with reference to its recuperative powers gained in a day.



entered this country [Ta Yüe-çi] saw the ox without being aware of the fact that it is there regarded as a precious rarity. The Chinese said that in their country there were silkworms the size of a finger, feeding on the leaves of mulberry-trees and producing silk for the benefit of man, but those foreigners would not believe in the existence of silkworms."

It does not require much sagacity to recognize in the transcription \*g'iep, g'iev an Indo-European word and in particular one of Iranian characteristics,—Avestan *gav-*, Middle Persian *gav*, *gō*, New Persian *gāv*, Armenian *kov*, Sanskrit *gāv-*. Above all, however, the Yüe-çi form agrees closely, also in its vocalism, with Yazgulami *γēw* ("taureau") from \**yāwa*, recently disclosed by R. GAUTHIOT;<sup>1</sup> Ossetian *gäwd*, and Scythian *godī* (from \**gowdi*). It is a Scytho-Iranian type of word.

There can be no doubt, either, that the notion of the decreasing and increasing bull of the Yüe-çi answers to a mythical conception of specifically Iranian type, which the sober and prosaic Chinese were of course unable to grasp: it is the waxing and waning of the moon that is symbolized in the image of the bull.<sup>2</sup> Compare Avestan *ævōdāta* and *gaōčīθra*.

4. 翮 or 翮侯 *hi-hou*, \**h'iep* (or *hep*)-*gou*, *hiev-gou*. Title of the five satraps of the Yüe-çi, wrongly read *yap-hau* by HIRTH<sup>3</sup> and identified by him with the Turkish title 葉護 *ye-hu*, \**yab* (*džab*, *šab*)-*gu*.<sup>4</sup> The two titles, however, have nothing to do with each other. The title *hi-hou* is

<sup>1</sup> Notes sur le Yazgoulami, dialecte iranien des confins du Pamir (*Journal asiatique*, 1916, mars-avril, p. 264).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. for instance, DARMESTETER, *Etudes iraniennes*, Vol. II, p. 292; L. H. GRAY, *Spiegel Memorial Volume*, pp. 160-168; G. HÜSING, *Iranische Überlieferung*, pp. 23-54.—The ox appears to have been an important domestic animal among the Yüe-çi. According to the *T'un tien* 通典, written by Tu Yu 杜佑 from A.D. 766 to 801, the Great Yüe-çi availed themselves of four-wheeled carts (unknown to the Chinese), which in proportion to their size were drawn by four, six, or eight oxen.

<sup>3</sup> *Nachworte*, p. 47. The foundation of this reading is the modern Cantonese dialect, but it is erroneous to identify the latter with ancient Chinese (see my *Sino-Iranica*, No. II). There is no reason to assume that 翮 ever had the reading \**yap* in ancient times; *yap* is merely a development peculiar to Cantonese. The *fan-ts'ie* of the character in question is indicated in K'añ-hi by 許及 and 迄及, the sound being 吸, that is, *h'iep* or *hep*. Moreover, Hirth's identification of the title *hi-hou* with *ye-hu* is entirely arbitrary, not being supported by any Chinese text. If the two transcriptions, which phonetically are different, were intended to render the same foreign word, the ancient commentators would certainly not have failed to call attention to it.

<sup>4</sup> Regarding the phonology of *ye* cf. PELLIOT, *Bull. de l'Ecole française*, Vol. IV, pp. 267-269.

applied by the Chinese also to Hiun-nu, Wu-sun, and Sogdians. There is no reason to assume with the Turkomaniacs that it should be of Turkish origin: the Chinese themselves say nothing to this effect; but if the term is equally found among three Scythian or Turanian groups, compared with a single Turkish tribe, the greater probability is that the title is of Turanian origin and a Turanian loan-word in Hiun-nu. In my opinion the word itself is of Scythian origin, the first element being connected with Armenian *šahap*, from Iranian \*šarhap, šahrap (Old Persian *xsaθrapāvan*, *σατραπης*).<sup>1</sup> Again, we observe the peculiar vocalism of Yüe-či: the vocalization *hiep* or *hiev*, compared with Iranian *-hap*, corresponds exactly to *giev*—Iranian *gav* (No. 3).

In regard to the second element *gou*, I have not yet arrived at a positive conclusion, but will offer merely a suggestion. It is well known that Young-Avestan *gava* is used as a synonyme of Sogdiana, and that the Pahlavi translation explains this word by *dašt* ("plain"). DARMESTETER<sup>2</sup> has therefore conceived *gava* as a noun with the meaning "plain," and compared it with Gothic *gawi* ("county, country"), Old High German *gewi*, *gowwi*, Middle High German *gou*, *gou*. The Yüe-či word *gou* may be related to this Germanic word, and the term *hap-gou* may signify as much as "county-prefect."

5. From the royal names Kaniška, Huška, Huviška, Vāsuška, we may well infer that *-ška* was an ending peculiar to the language of the Yüe-či. S. LÉVI<sup>3</sup> has joined to these forms the tribal name Turuška, which in fact is based on the name "Turk," but also serves for the designation of the Kušana or Indo-Scythians. In 1896 I indicated from the Mahāvvyutpatti the Sanskrit-Tibetan term *turuška* or *turuka* for the designation of frankincense (*Gummi olibanum* or *Thus orientale*). The *Pen ts'ao kan mu* gives Sanskrit *turuškam* as a synonyme of *su-ho* ("storax"), but evidently a confusion with frankincense has here arisen.<sup>4</sup> Turuška, however, does not mean, as believed by RHYS DAVIDS, "Turkish incense,"<sup>5</sup> but "incense of the Indo-Scythians." In the chapter *Žui yin t'u* 瑞應圖 of the *Sun šu* it is on record that in A.D. 458 the country Yüe-či 月支 sent as tribute divine incense 神香, which

<sup>1</sup> HÜBSCHMANN, Armenische Grammatik, Vol. I, p. 208; cf. also the note of ANDREAS in A. Christensen, L'Empire des Sassanides, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> Le Zend-Avesta, Vol. II, p. 7.

<sup>3</sup> *Journal asiatique*, 1897, janv.-févr., p. 11.

<sup>4</sup> PELLLOT, *T'oung Pao*, 1912, p. 478.

<sup>5</sup> See PELLLOT, *Journal asiatique*, 1914, sept.-oct., p. 418. As to *tarukkha*, the Pāli equivalent for *turuška*, adopted by Rhys Davids, it should be remarked that A. WEBER (*Abh. B. Ak.*, 1871, p. 85) had already explained *turuška* from \**turukkha*.



was examined by the Emperor Hiao Wu 孝武. It had the appearance of swallow-eggs, and there were three lumps altogether, in size resembling a jujube. The emperor refused to burn it, and had it transferred to the treasury. Subsequently an epidemic broke out in the capital Č'añ-nan. The officials were infected and requested the emperor to burn a lump of the precious incense in order to ward off the pestilence. The emperor then burned it, whereby those sick in the palace were relieved. At a distance of a hundred *li* around Č'añ-nan, the odor of this incense was perceptible, and even after nine months, had not yet gone. Hence Chinese writers on incense have established the term "Yüe-či incense" 月支香.<sup>1</sup> It follows from this story that only real frankincense can be involved. The ending *-ska* certainly is not Turkish, but Scytho-Iranian.

6. The tribal name Yüe-či has been much discussed, but a phonetically correct restoration has not yet been secured. The name in the writing 月氏 appears in the first part of the second century B.C., and probably was first committed to writing in the memoranda and documents of General Č'añ K'ien himself. We are confronted, accordingly, with the transcription of a foreign name attempted in the early Han period; and, as is well known, we are practically ignorant of what the phonetic condition of the Chinese language was in that era. The philological science of the Chinese permits us to restore the structure of words to the speech of the T'añ period, but beyond this we tread upon unsafe ground. Yet there is hope that the progress of comparative Indo-Chinese philology will also reveal to us some day the sounds of the language of the Han. In view of this state of affairs it behooves us the more to proceed cautiously and to heed all available data in the attempt to reconstruct the name by which the Yüe-či designated their nation. Especially Chinese comment bearing on it must not be taken lightly, as was done by A. v. STAËL-HOLSTEIN.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately the

<sup>1</sup> *Hiañ p'u* 香譜 by Huñ Č'u 洪龜 of the Sun period, p. 11 b (ed. of T'añ Sun ts'uñ šu); *Miñ hiañ p'u* 名香譜, cited in *Pien tse lei pien*, Ch. 7, p. 6 b.

<sup>2</sup> The speculations of A. v. STAËL-HOLSTEIN (SPAW, 1914, pp. 643-650 and repeated in JRAS, 1914, p. 754) are entirely inadmissible. He has a rather comfortable method of discarding any evidence that is opposed to his preconceived theory of the identity of 月氏 with his artificial \*Kuši, alleged to be the nominative singular of Kuša. In order to suit the purpose of this fantasy, the reading *či* 支 for *ši* demanded by the Chinese philologists must be senselessly sacrificed: it is branded as "unauthoritative," while Wylie is heralded as an "authority," for he consistently transcribes Yuě-she. In one of the old dialects, according to Staël-Holstein, 月氏 was pronounced Gur-ši or Kur-ši (again on p. 650: Kuši). The authority of Yen Ši-ku in matters of Chinese philology is still to be regarded at least as high as that of Wylie and Staël-Holstein. In favor of his theory the data of Chinese history must



ancient commentators, while they give us positive information as to the phonetic value of the second element, fail to enlighten us on the first part. There is, however, a full interpretation of the name in a work of mediæval date, which has been overlooked by previous writers. Yo Ši 樂史, author of the *T'ai p'in huan yü ki*<sup>1</sup> in the latter part of the tenth century, explains the pronunciation of 月氏 by means of the characters 肉支; that is, \*žuk-či or \*n'iuk-či (d'i). This, of course, is striking, since the character 月 was anciently possessed of a final dental, but never of a final guttural. Yo Ši adduces no source or authority for his comment, but as he proves himself well informed and appears to have utilized original documents of the T'añ period, he may have derived this suggestion from a T'añ source. The idea underlying his explanation is that the character is not taken by him as the classifier 73 ('moon'), but as the classifier 130 肉, which is written also with a variant 月 (somewhat different in shape from 月 'moon') that appears in combinations with this classifier. It is difficult to believe that, if right from the beginning the character 月 of Yüe-či should have conveyed the phonetic \*žuk or \*n'iuk, the ancient commentators should not have drawn attention to this anomaly. The opinion of Yo Ši leads us nowhere, but it merits to be kept in mind.

The direction of the commentators is that the second element 氏 ši should be read 支 či,<sup>2</sup> and later works have indeed substituted this character for the former.<sup>3</sup> The fact that the verdict of these old philologists is not arbitrary, as arbitrarily asserted by A. v. Staël-Holstein, is plainly to be seen from other names, for instance, the transcription 闐氏 *yen-či*, designating the queen of the Hiñ-nu, where

---

be discredited and turned upside down. It is perfectly obvious, however, that the two names Yüe-či and Kušana, both of which were known to the Chinese, are by no means etymologically interrelated, but thoroughly independent. Kušana was known to the Chinese in the form 貴霜 \*Kwi-sañ, and they were aware of the fact that \*Kwi-sañ was one of five satrapies or principalities, and that 丘就却 K'iu-tsiu-k'io (Kuzulakadphises; regarding the Chinese transcription see PELLIOT, *Journal asiatique*, 1914, sept.-oct., p. 401), after the subjection of the four other satrapies, established himself as king of \*Kwi-sañ. Kušana, as pointed out by F. W. THOMAS (JRAS, 1906, p. 203) is not a tribal name, but a family or dynastic title; otherwise we should not have an Indian inscription describing Kaniska as "propagator of the Kushan stock." See also J. MARQUART, *Chronologie der alttürkischen Inschriften*, p. 59.

<sup>1</sup> Ch. 184, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Ts'ien Han šu*, Ch. 61, p. 1; *Hou Han šu*, Ch. 118, p. 5.

<sup>3</sup> The writing 月支 appears in a document from Niya (CHAVANNES, in Stein, *Khotan*, p. 540).

Yen Ši-ku clearly formulates the rule that anciently the character 氏 had the sound *ši* (昔氏音支).<sup>1</sup>

This verdict cannot be overruled in favor of any hypothesis to be attached to the name Yüe-či. Likewise in the name of the district 烏氏, *ši* is to be pronounced *ši*. The question arises, however, as to how the character 支 was articulated in early times. The opinion of KLAPROTH, who adopted the reading Yüe-ti, that *t* may often be replaced by *č*, cannot be set aside so completely, as has been done by O. FRANKE;<sup>2</sup> save that Klaproth did not express himself very clearly; he doubtless meant to say that palatal *č* or *tš* may develop from dental *t*; and this, in fact, is a common phenomenon in Indo-Chinese. Moreover, it is justly emphasized by PELLIOT<sup>3</sup> that the small dash differentiating at present the symbol 氏 *ti* from 氏 is a comparatively recent affair, so that formerly the latter character might have been read *ši* as well as *ti*. Pelliot is further right in concluding that under the Former Han the character 氏 was sounded with a dental initial more or less palatalized (mouillé), but not with a palatal and still less with a fricative. As Wañ Č'uñ offers the variant 焉提 Yen-t'i in lieu of 關氏 Yen-či, and as *t'i* answers to an ancient \**di*, there is good reason to assume that also 氏 and likewise 支 were at that period articulated *d'i*, *di*, or *ti*.<sup>4</sup> Thus there is also reason to believe that this element *-di* or *-ti* was assimilated to the final dental

<sup>1</sup> The restoration of the transcription *yen-ši* presents a complex problem, as the commentators offer various means of reconstructing the prototype. The *Ši ki so yin* states that *yen-ši* should be read 曷氏 \**had-di* or \**hat-ti*, which would indeed lead to Turkish *xatun* (*qatun*, *khatun*). In ancient times this word had several phonetic variants: we have in T'u-küe \**kahatun* 可賀敦 (*k'o-ho-tun*) and \**katun* 可敦 (*k'o-tun*), in T'u-yü-hun \**katsun* 恪尊 (*k'o-tsun*), and in T'o-pa \**kasun* 可孫 (*k'o-sun*). It seems to me that the Hiuñ-nu word \**haddi* (= \**haddun*) represents the primeval form, and that \**katsun* and \**kasun* are subsequent developments. It is difficult to see, however, why the Chinese wrote *yen*, if the sound phenomenon *had* was intended; but whatever the basis of this identification may be, there can be no doubt of the existence of the Hiuñ-nu word \**had-di* itself. It is obvious that Yen Ši-ku visualized a different term of the Hiuñ-nu language when (*Ts'ien Han šu*, Ch. 94 A, p. 5) he defines the *fan-ts'ie* of *yen* by means of 於連 (*yien*). It is singular that K. SHIRATORI (*Sprache des Hiung-nu Stammes*, p. 4), in dealing with this word, does not heed the Chinese indications, although he quotes them, and identifies the word with Uigur *abeši* or *evči*, which in my opinion is impossible.

<sup>2</sup> Zur Kenntnis der Türkvölker, pp. 22-23. The variant 氏 does not occur quite so rarely, as assumed by Franke. It is employed in K'añ-hi's Dictionary, and may be seen in the *Šu kien* 蜀鑑 edited by Kuo Yün-t'ao 郭允蹈 in 1236 (Ch. 9, p. 3; ed. of *Šou šan ko ts'un šu*). At any rate 氏 is merely a graphic, not a phonetic variant.

<sup>3</sup> *Journal asiatique*, 1912, juillet-août, p. 169.

<sup>4</sup> See also PELLIOT, *Bull. de l'Ecole française*, Vol. V, p. 428.



of the first part, 月, and that this final may have been not a surd, but a sonant. In the same manner as in Tibetan, it will be shown that also in Chinese the final explosives were originally all sonants (partially also liquids).

The ancient phonetic formation of 月 is somewhat complex and very far from being such a simple affair as *get*, as confidently asserted by former sinologues, in order to fall into the trap of the Getae and Massagetae. The original initial was not a guttural sonant, but the guttural nasal *ñ*, which is plainly indicated by the *fan-ts'ie* 魚厥 (\**ni k'iud*) and the sound equivalent 軌, which, in the same manner as 月, still has in Sino-Annamese the pronunciation *ñüet*. Further, this initial *ñ* was palatalized (mouillé) and labialized (provided with so-called *ho-k'ou* 合口); that is, phonetically written, \**ñ'wiet* or *ñ'wied*, *ñ'wied*.<sup>1</sup>

The initial *ñ* seems to have had a tendency to develop into *g* during the T'añ period. In an Uigur Sutra the name Yüe-çi is said to be transcribed Kitsi or Ketsi.<sup>2</sup> Of course, this transcription made after a Chinese mode of articulating the term in the T'añ period (provided the identification were correct, which is doubtful) would have no absolute value for the restoration of the ancient form of the name which makes its début some eight hundred years earlier. The fact remains that initial *ñ* (now *ɣ*) generally corresponds to *g* in the transcriptions made in the age of the T'añ,<sup>3</sup> and if the transcription Yüe-çi had originated in that period, we should be perfectly justified in restoring it to a form with initial *g*. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the transcription was made early in the second century B.C. under the Han; and that the same rules then prevailed as under the T'añ, no one can affirm. The greater probability is that phonetic conditions were then somewhat different and perhaps more complicated than in mediæval times. In Iranian and Scythian names we have always to reckon with double

<sup>1</sup> In this correct form it is transcribed, for instance, by H. MASPERO, *Etudes sur la phonétique historique de la langue annamite*, p. 94. See also PELLIOT, *Bull. de l'Ecole française*, Vol. V, p. 443. The *ho-k'ou* is still preserved in Fu-kien *iwok* and Japanese *gwatsu*. It is only through this *ho-k'ou* that the utilization of 月 in the transcriptions of Sanskrit for *vit* and *vut* becomes intelligible (see, for instance, examples in VOLPICELLI, *Prononciation ancienne du chinois*, p. 179; and SCHLEGEL, *Secret of the Chinese Method*, p. 98). Concerning the use of 月 in the transcription of an Iranian word see the writer's *Sino-Iranica*, No. 18.

<sup>2</sup> According to F. W. K. MÜLLER, *Uigurica*, p. 15; but according to PELLIOT (*Traité manichéen*, p. 29), the Chinese equivalent corresponding to Kitsi is the name 義淨 \**Ni-tsin* (Yi-tsin).

<sup>3</sup> Examples may be seen in CHAVANNES and PELLIOT, *Traité manichéen*, pp. 29, 42.

consonants which it was difficult for Chinese to reproduce. From my Sino-Iranica it will be seen that Chinese initial *s* and *š* may correspond to Iranian *xs* and *xš*.<sup>1</sup> A somewhat vacillating initial as that of 月 indicates very well that it should answer to a combination of foreign sounds unfamiliar to a Chinese ear. This assumption being made, there are two hypothetical reconstructions possible: \*n'wied-di would lead either to \*aň'wied-di or to \*sgwied-di. The latter is the more probable one, and bears all the characteristics of a Scytho-Iranian name. It comes very near to the Suguda of the Old Persian inscriptions (Avestan *Suyda*), the name of the Sogdoi or Sogdians. I do not mean to say that the two names are physically identical, but only that there is a linguistic relationship between the two.

As regards the element *di* (*d'i*, or eventually even *tī*), I hold that it should be conceived as the ending of the plural, and that the plural suffix *-di* is on a par with the plural-suffixes, *-tā* of Ossetian, *-tau* of Scythian, and *-t* or *-y-t* of Sogdian and Yagnōbi.<sup>2</sup> The identification of the name Yüe-či with that of the Getae and Massagetae, in my opinion, is out of the question. Not only phonetic, but also geographical and historical reasons run counter to this assumption.<sup>3</sup> Also the identification with *Ἰάτιοι*<sup>4</sup> must be rejected, likewise any alleged relation of the name to that of the Ye-t'a (\*Yep-dal, Ebdal, Abdal) or Ephtalites. The latter, however, are not Huns, as wrongly asserted by SPECHT, but in the same manner as the Yüe-či, are Indo-Europeans, that is, Scythic Iranians. Likewise so were the ancient Wu-sun, as I hope to demonstrate in a subsequent article. Turkistan, before being settled by Turki, was a country of Iranians.

O. FRANKE<sup>5</sup> has justly called attention to the fact that very close relations and intermarriage existed between the Yüe-či and the Sogdians (K'aň-kü 康居); and the kings of Sogdiana are said to have descended from the Yüe-či and to have gloried in this extraction. It seems to me

<sup>1</sup> A similar phenomenon obtains in the Sanskrit transcriptions: for instance, Ki-pin, based on \*Ki-spir = Ptolemy's Kasparia. In the same manner, the Sino-Iranian word 鑛 *pin* ("a fine steel imported from Persia") is based on Iranian \*spin (Sariqoli *spin*, Afghan *ōspīnah* or *ōspanah*, Ossetian *afseināg*, "iron").

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. MILLER, *Sprache der Osseten*, p. 42; J. MARQUART, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran*, II, pp. 77-79; R. GAUTHIOT, *Du pluriel persan en -hā* (*Mém. Soc. de Linguistique de Paris*, Vol. XX, 1916, pp. 74-75).

<sup>3</sup> On this point I concur with the opinion of MARQUART (*Eranšahr*, p. 206).

<sup>4</sup> TOMASCHKE, *Sogdiana*, SWA, 1877, p. 159.

<sup>5</sup> *L. c.*, p. 67.



that the cause of this mutual good feeling was given in the linguistic relationship of the two peoples.<sup>1</sup>

When Sieg and Siegling published their memorable study of one of the Indo-European languages rediscovered from ancient manuscripts of Turkistan, they styled this language Tokharian and further defined it in the very title of their publication as "the language of the Indo-Scythians."<sup>2</sup> It has been recognized long ago that both these designations are hazardous.<sup>3</sup> "Indo-Scythian" is out of the question as a

<sup>1</sup> Regarding Indo-Scythian proper names see F. W. THOMAS, JRAS, 1906, pp. 204-216. I do not believe that 謝 Sie (the vice-roy of the Yüe-çi, vanquished by Pan Č'ao in A.D. 90) represents the title *sāhi* (S. LÉVI, *Journal asiatique*, 1915, janv.-févr., p. 86), as *sie* answers to an ancient \**zie*. I take the liberty of calling attention to some contradictions in the history of the Kushan dynasty of India, as conceived by our scholars, and Chinese accounts of the Yüe-çi. According to V. A. SMITH (Early History of India, 3d ed., 1914, p. 272), the reign of the last Kushan ruler, Vāsudeva, terminated according to the chronology now tentatively adopted, in A.D. 178, and the year 226 denotes the collapse of the Kushan power in India (p. 278). The *Wei lio*, however, informs us that during the period of the Three Kingdoms (San kuo, A.D. 221-277) Kashmir (Ki-pin), Bactria (Ta-hia), Kabul (Kao-fu) and India (T'ien-ču) were all subject to the Great Yüe-çi (*San kuo č'i*, *Wei č'i*, Ch. 30, p. 12 b; and CHAVANNES' translation, *T'oung Pao*, 1905, pp. 538, 539; CHAVANNES remarks, "Thus, in the middle of the third century, the power of the Kushan kings, was at its climax." See also J. KENNEDY, JRAS, 1913, p. 1057, who called attention to the text of the *Wei lio*). Moreover, we have in the Annals of the Wei dynasty (*Wei č'i*, Ch. 3, p. 3) the record of an embassy sent in the twelfth month of the winter of the fourth year of the period T'ai-ho 太和 (A.D. 230) by the king of the Great Yüe-çi called 波調 Po-tiao, \*Pwa-div; that is, Vasudeva. Of course, this Vasudeva may be different from the one of V. A. Smith, but the Chinese text shows us that as late as A.D. 230 at least the Kushan dynasty was still in power. According to Smith, historical material for the third century is completely lacking in India, and nothing definite is recorded concerning the dynasties of northern India, excluding the Panjab, during that period. See also CHAVANNES, *T'oung Pao*, 1904, p. 489.

<sup>2</sup> E. SIEG and W. SIEGLING, *Tocharisch, die Sprache der Indoskythen*, SPA, 1908, pp. 915-934. Neither the determination Tokharian nor Indo-Scythian is due to these authors, but to F. W. K. MÜLLER (SPA, 1907, p. 960). S. LÉVI always shifts the responsibility on Sieg and Siegling (*Journal asiatique*, 1911, mai-juin, p. 432; and JRAS, 1914, p. 959).

<sup>3</sup> Whereas A. MEILLET has determined the historical position of "Tokharian" with as much acumen as circumspect scholarship, without committing himself to any nomenclature and any theory, German scholars hastened to make the "Tokharians," whose very name in this connection is not yet assured, subservient to their wild speculations regarding the alleged primeval home of the Indo-Europeans. E. MEYER (*Geschichte des Altertums*, 3d ed., Vol. I, pt. 2, pp. 892-893) popularizes Müller's nomenclature, which he accepts without restraint, and proclaims that the old hypothesis of the origin of the Indo-Europeans from Asia has gained considerably from this discovery. The question of the "Tokharian" language, which is one of

proof that  
Indo-Scythians  
are  
NOT  
Yüe-çi

label for so-called Tokharian; the two are entirely different things. This can now be actually demonstrated by referring to the word for "ox." This is *okso* in so-called Tokharian, while, as we have seen, it is *g'iev* or *gev* in Yüe-çi or Indo-Scythian. The Tokharian word, accordingly, bears a strictly European character; the Yüe-çi word, a Scytho-Iranian character. We further note that Yüe-çi possesses initial and final sonants, which are lacking in Tokharian. The two languages, in consequence, belong to two sharply distinct groups of Indo-European types of speech. Yüe-çi is a member of the same group as Scythian, Sogdian, Ossetian, and Yagnōbi.

---

mediæval form, has nothing to do with this problem. Also the alleged identity of the "Tokharian" suffix *-aššül* with Hittite *-aššil* (MEYER, *l.c.*; S. FEIST, *Kultur der Indogermanen*, p. 431) must be rejected.









C039647265

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any  
University of California Library  
or to the

NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY  
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station  
University of California  
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

---

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling (510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date.

---

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

---

**JUL 13 1998**

---

**FEB 12 2001**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

